

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention, in that the steps of a statutory "process" must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has allowed claims 15-17.

Applicants submit that the steps of the method, as claimed in amended claims 1, 11 and 14, are clearly tied to particular apparatus. As such, Applicants believe that claims 1-14 are now statutory.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-17, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by           /Edward W. Goodman/            
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611